DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 202 406 HE 013 927

AUTHOR Crosson, Patricia H.
TITLE Statewide Coordination and Planning in Higher Education: A Report on Regional Conferences about Implementation of the "Master Plan for Higher Education in Pennsylvania - 1978." Occasional Paper No. 1.
INSTITUTION Pittsburgh Univ., Pa. Inst. for Higher Education.
PUB DATE 79
NOTE 71p.
AVAILABLE FROM Institute for Higher Education, School of Education, University of Pittsburgh, 5S01 Forbes Quadrangle, Pittsburgh, PA 15260.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Accessibility (for Disabled); Access to Education; Articulation (Education); *College Planning; Community Colleges; *Conferences; Educational Finance; Educational History; *Educational Objectives; Educational Quality; Equal Education; Governance; *Higher Education; *Master Plans; Nontraditional Students; Program Implementation; State Boards of Education; State Colleges; State Universities; *Statewide Planning; Student Financial Aid; Trend Analysis
IDENTIFIERS *Pennsylvania

ABSTRACT

Perspectives on eight regional conferences that were held to discuss implementation of the 1978 master plan for higher education in Pennsylvania are considered. The development of statewide systems of higher education and their increased reliance on statewide master planning is traced, and the history of coordination, governance, and planning in Pennsylvania is compared with national trends. The presentations and disucssion that occurred in the eight conferences are summarized, and the 37 recommendations from the master plan are summarized and presented in full in the appendix. Chapter one of the 1978 master plan presents some projections about the environment of the 1980s that will affect higher education in Pennsylvania. Chapter two addresses the goals of higher education in Pennsylvania, and specifically, the goals of the State Board of Education, including quality education, access, and governance and coordination. Chapter three describes the system of higher education in Pennsylvania and establishes the mission of the five sectors and contains recommendations in the areas of statewide planning and governance. Chapter four considers access to higher education in terms of financial access, student assistance, geographical access, physical access, and access for women and minorities. Chapter five defines academic quality and provides a list of criteria for measuring the level of quality of an institution. It also includes a number of recommendations calling for institutional actions in the areas of general education, graduate and professional education, adult and continuing education, counseling, research, transfer of credit among institutions, and articulation with basic education. Chapter six addresses financing Pennsylvania's system of higher education. Observations on the conferences and on master planning in Pennsylvania are also presented. A bibliography is appended. (SW)

ED202406

Occasional Paper No. 1

STATEWIDE COORDINATION AND PLANNING IN HIGHER EDUCATION: A REPORT ON REGIONAL CONFERENCES ABOUT IMPLEMENTATION OF THE MASTER PLAN FOR HIGHER EDUCATION IN PENNSYLVANIA - 1978

by

Patricia H. Crosson

Assistant Professor, Program in Higher Education

and

Institute for Higher Education

University of Pittsburgh

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Patricia H. Crosson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

HE 013 927

Copyright © 1979 by the Institute for Higher Education
University of Pittsburgh

All rights reserved. No part of this report may be reproduced by any means without prior written permission.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Editor's Introduction ii

Author's Introduction iii

Part I Coordination and Planning in Statewide Higher Education Systems. 1

Patterns and Issues in Coordination and Planning . . 1

Coordination and Planning in Pennsylvania. 8

Part II Regional Conferences on Implementation of the 1978 Master Plan 14

Overview of Conferences. 14

Reactions to the 1978 Master Plan. 18

Chapter 1 - The Educational Environment of the Eighties 18

Chapter 2 - Goals of Higher Education. 21

Chapter 3 - The Commonwealth System of Higher Education. 22

Chapter 4 - Equal Opportunity and Access to Higher Education. 27

Chapter 5 - Academic Quality and Educational Opportunity. 30

Chapter 6 - Financing Higher Education 34

Summary of Responses to the 1978 Master Plan Recommendations. 39

Part III Observations. 41

The Regional Conferences. 41

Master Planning and Coordination in Pennsylvania. . 45

Epilogue. 50

Bibliography. 54

Appendix Recommendations Contained in The Master Plan for Higher Education - 1978 56

EDITOR'S INTRODUCTION

This is the inaugural publication in a series being sponsored by the Institute for Higher Education at the University of Pittsburgh. The series is designed to further the research mission of the Institute by providing a forum for the presentation of current research, commentary, and debate about issues of concern to the higher education community.

It is quite fitting that this first paper in the series should contain a chronicle and an assessment of the early activities (namely, regional conferences) conducted in Pennsylvania for planning implementation of The Master Plan for Higher Education in Pennsylvania - 1978. Historically, the Institute has focused its endeavors on matters of concern to higher education in its immediate geographic vicinity. However, in addition to reporting comments made at the regional conferences about the many recommendations contained in the 1978 Master Plan, Dr. Crosson has placed her discussion in the more general context of statewide planning in higher education by reviewing both similar efforts in other states and related literature in the field. Hence, this report addresses policy concerns that are important for statewide coordination of higher education systems, not only in Pennsylvania but in other states as well.

John C. Weidman, Series Editor

AUTHOR'S INTRODUCTION

During the winter and spring of 1979, eight conferences were sponsored by the regional higher education councils of Pennsylvania to discuss implementation of the recommendations contained in The Master Plan for Higher Education in Pennsylvania - 1978. The 1978 Master Plan represents the culmination of a multiyear effort in which over two hundred persons worked together to chart future directions for higher education in Pennsylvania. As of the date of its approval by the State Board of Education (November 10, 1978), the 1978 Master Plan constitutes State Board of Education policy for all higher education in Pennsylvania.

The process and product of master planning in Pennsylvania parallels similar developments in states across the nation. In most states during the first half of this century, public and private colleges and universities existed as discrete and separate institutions. Typically, each institution had its own governing board with nearly total discretion over policy matters. Self-conscious cooperation and joint planning among these institutions rarely occurred. In response, however, to the increasing size, cost, and complexity of higher education since World War II, state after state has established a system of higher education that includes virtually all institutions in the public sector and often those in the private sector. These systems emphasize mutuality and shared interest as well as diversity among component parts. Systemwide coordination and/or governance has become the norm. States have undertaken master planning as a systemwide activity whose primary purpose is to match the needs and resources of the state with the missions and functions of the colleges and universities within the system.

This report assesses the eight regional conferences in the context of The Master Plan for Higher Education in Pennsylvania - 1978, and the national trend toward centralized coordination and master planning. It results from a project originally undertaken for the Southwestern Pennsylvania Higher Education Council, Inc. by the Institute for Higher Education at the University of Pittsburgh. The Institute, a research and service unit concerned with issues of current concern in the higher education community, offered to assist the Southwest Council in planning for its 1978 Master Plan conference by having an affiliate of the Institute attend and report on the first three regional conferences. The Southwest Council agreed and its President, David McCormick, obtained permission from the other council chairmen for attendance by the Institute representative.

To carry out the project, the Institute for Higher Education designated a project team consisting of Dr. Henry Hausdorff, Director of the Institute; Dr. Patricia Crosson, an Assistant Professor of Higher Education at the University of Pittsburgh whose research and teaching interests are in the areas of institutional/state relations, educational policy, and planning; and Mr. Ronald Volpe, a higher education doctoral student and graduate assistant with the Institute for Higher Education.

During the course of attending the first few regional conferences, it became apparent that important issues of concern to the higher education community, both in Pennsylvania and across the country, were being raised. Because of the importance of the conferences for the study of statewide higher education planning and because there appeared to be no plans for the sharing of information about the conferences across the regions, the project was expanded to include all eight regional conferences. The chairmen of the regional councils sponsoring the remaining conferences were contacted and they, too, permitted

participation by a representative from the Institute. In return for the opportunity to attend the conferences, the Institute representative provided each chairman with a report on that regional conference. In many cases, these reports were used by the regions in preparation of the formal reports to the Department of Education and the Pennsylvania 1202 Commission. These conference reports were also used as the basis for the section of the present report which summarizes the reactions voiced in all eight conferences to the 1978 Master Plan.

In Part I of this report, I trace the development of statewide systems of higher education and their increased reliance on statewide master planning. The history of coordination, governance, and planning in Pennsylvania is compared and contrasted with national trends. In Part II, I review the 1978 Master Plan and report reactions to each of its 37 recommendations voiced during the eight regional conferences. In Part III, I report my observations on the regional conferences, and on master planning in Pennsylvania as well as its significance for higher education. In brief, I conclude that while the conferences served the useful purpose of providing a forum for information sharing and dialogue among representatives of colleges and universities, regional councils, the Pennsylvania Department of Education, and a newly appointed Secretary of Education, they gave only general guidance on implementation of the 1978 Master Plan. At the same time, planning efforts in Pennsylvania are important to developments in other states and to higher education more generally.

The eight regional conferences on implementation of the 1978 Master Plan were only one part of the master planning process in Pennsylvania. The 1978 Master Plan, itself, calls upon colleges and universities and the regional councils to provide written reactions to the recommendations. The Pennsylvania

Association of Colleges and Universities (PACU), among other groups, has also prepared written comments on the 1978 Master Plan. I have not reviewed these materials nor been present at the public hearings or other meetings in which the 1978 Master Plan was discussed. The report and observations that follow are based solely on my review of the Task Force reports and the 1978 Master Plan, my participation at the regional conferences, and my general knowledge of statewide coordination and master planning in higher education. It is not intended to represent the official positions of the colleges and universities in Pennsylvania, the regional councils, or the Institute for Higher Education at the University of Pittsburgh. I hope, however, that it will be of interest to the higher education community in Pennsylvania and to others concerned with issues of governance and planning in higher education.

I am grateful to the following chairmen of the regional councils for making attendance possible and for providing helpful information:

Dr. Allen T. Bonnell	Region 1, Delaware Valley Planning Council for Higher Education
Mr. Charles Churchman	Region 2, Higher Education Planning Council
Dr. William David	Region 3, Northeastern Pennsylvania Regional Planning Council for Higher Education
Dr. Stanley Ikenberry	Region 4, Planning Council
Dr. Richard McDowell	Region 5, Northwestern Pennsylvania Planning Council for Higher Education
Dr. Gilmore Seavers	Region 6, Capitol Region Planning Council
Dr. Frederick Binder	Region 7, Council of Higher Education
Mr. David McCormick	Region 8, Southwestern Pennsylvania Higher Education Council, Inc.

Special thanks are due to Mr. David McCormick, Chairman of the Southwestern Pennsylvania Higher Education Council for providing his support for the project.

Within the Institute for Higher Education at the University of Pittsburgh, the author wishes to thank Dr. Henry Hausdorff and Mr. Ronald Volpe for their help as team members for this project; Dr. John Weidman for his comments on drafts of the report; and Mrs. Caroline Good, without whose expert secretarial assistance nothing would have been possible.

Patricia H. Crosson

Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
June 15, 1979

PART I

COORDINATION AND PLANNING IN STATEWIDE HIGHER EDUCATION SYSTEMS

Patterns and Issues in Coordination and Planning

From the time of the American revolution and early unsuccessful attempts to develop a national university, the United States has had a strong tradition of state involvement in higher education. While this has been most evident in the development and provision of financial support for many public institutions of higher education, states are increasingly providing support for independent institutions as well.

While states have long recognized responsibility for and supported higher education, for many years they also maintained a strong tradition of noninterference in the policy and operation of colleges and universities. Authority to make policy decisions was generally delegated to lay governing boards. State-level policy for higher education has consisted, for the most part, of decisions to establish new institutions, to appoint governing board members, and to provide necessary financial resources.

The period following World War II brought many changes, the most obvious of which was the vastly increased demand for higher education. States labored to respond by increasing the size of existing institutions; creating many new four-year and graduate institutions; developing extensive community college systems; and, most importantly, providing the resources necessary to fuel the system. Initially, the traditions for delegation to governing boards and policy formation at the institutional, rather than the state, level were not altered. Gradually, this changed as institutions began to be grouped into multicampus systems under one executive office and governing board. The annual

process of requesting state funds was no longer merely a budget exercise, but it became a forum for negotiating basic institutional directions. State after state acted to create a statewide board or council with responsibilities for coordinating higher education.

Although each state acted independently, the structure, power and activities of state-level boards differed markedly from state to state. There were, however, two predominant patterns. In the first, existing institutional governing boards were replaced with a single statewide higher education governing board which had the responsibility to set policy for institutions within the system. The second pattern did not replace institutional governing boards, but established a statewide coordinating board which had advisory powers and, usually, power to regulate institutions in certain areas. Thus, by the early 1970's considerable power in higher education had shifted from the individual colleges and universities to the state level. A number of authors have traced these developments over time (Glenny, 1959; Berdahl, 1971; Halstead, 1974; and Millard, 1976).

The following four patterns of statewide coordination have been identified by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (1976: Table 2):

A) No coordination over the entire public sector (9 states).

B) The consolidated board which governs the public sector also coordinates it (13 states)

C) Advisory coordinating board which gives advice to both state government and the institutions of higher education (9 states)

D) Regulatory coordinating board which has authority in its own right over one or more important aspects of the conduct of higher education, such as the right to approve or disapprove programs or to present a single consolidated budget for public higher education (19 states, including Pennsylvania)

Changes in state-level systemic structure and governance for higher education have been accompanied by a continuous and often acrimonious debate on

whether centralized control or institutional autonomy better protects the public interest and responds to state needs, while ensuring freedom and independence for colleges and universities. Many authors (especially Glenny, 1959, and Berdahl, 1971) have argued on behalf of statewide coordination for reasons of efficiency, nonduplication, and even preservation of institutional autonomy. Others, notably the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education (1971) and the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (1976) are concerned that statewide boards reduce the influence of students, faculty, and institutional boards and make governance both more cumbersome and more costly. After reviewing the controversy, Halstead (1974: 11) concluded:

> The evidence also reveals--and herein lies the crux of the controversy--that a winning combination is a yet unidentified balance which would retain most of the advantages of central control with a minimal sacrifice of institutional sovereignty. What persists as a continuing and intriguing challenge--and an issue of no little disagreement--is the search for a compromise between central coordination and autonomy that would create an optimal balance. The balance sought is delicate, and equilibrium may exist only in theory.

Throughout the debate on centralization vs. institutional autonomy, the one area of near consensus was that statewide planning is valuable. Most observers felt that in order to provide for the rapid growth of higher education, a statewide plan for development was essential. Such activity was different from institutional planning efforts because it called for a matching of statewide needs with institutional capabilities in terms of numbers of students served, numbers and types of institutions, numbers and levels of degree programs, and available state resources for meeting institutional needs.

Early plans varied considerably in content but a consensus on the areas to be covered in statewide plans for higher education developed gradually. Some underlying concerns of such planning may be summaried as follows:

> In its broadest sense, statewide planning must first be concerned with sets of goals: the economic and social goals of the state, the goals of the educational system and its institutions, the goals of the individuals within the system, and the interaction among these sets of goals. Then planning must be addressed to the optimum allocation of resources to accomplish the desired ends (Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, 1971: 31).

The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education also provides the following checklist of what should be considered for inclusion in statewide plans:

Statement of goals:
- .Educational
- .Social
- .Economic
- .Individual

Quantification of the goals, to the extent possible

Analysis in terms of enrollment, resources, and programs of present post-secondary education in the state, including:
- .Public and private colleges and universities
- .Public and private trade and technical schools
- .Present extent of use of new educational technologies
- .Opportunities for adult training and education
- .Geographic availability of institutions in the state

Projections for at least the short run (two to five years) and the intermediate period (five to fifteen years), including:
- .Enrollment trends categorized by institutional type and broadly defined programs
- .State manpower needs
- .Resource requirements-including faculty (area and level), physical facilities and equipment, libraries, and funding levels for operating and capital expenses

Consideration of present and potential arrangements with other states to maximize use of state resources

Extent of differentiation of function among types of institutions, and plans for bringing about desired changes in the pattern of differentiation

Analysis of the quality of existing programs and proposals for improvement

Analysis of the present degree of efficiency in use of educational resources and proposals for increasing efficiency

Definition of the state relation to private education, including descriptions of present and projected state aid to private education, if any

Analysis of existing requirements for admission and recommendations for any modifications if deemed advisable

Review of tuition levels at public institutions and, if any increases are projected, an analysis of the impacts of increased tuition on student financial aid requirements and enrollment at various types of institutions

Attention to the articulation of postsecondary education with secondary education, including consideration of advanced placement

Concern with the potential adaptability of changing educational needs of the system and the units within it

Evaluation of the adequacy of counseling for careers and for postsecondary education sufficiently early in a student's life to be effective and proposals for improving the programs if necessary

Identification of any other agencies outside postsecondary education which have major impacts on the way postsecondary education is able to function and suggestions for improving the interaction with these agencies (Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, 1971: 33-34).

Halstead's (1974) useful compendium on statewide planning also outlines the major components of statewide plans and provides detailed suggestions on how to gather, analyze and use data for planning purposes. According to him, the component features of master plans include:

1. Premises which form the basis for state educational objectives and which underlie the pattern of planning and coordination development
2. Immediate and long-range postsecondary educational goals of the state
3. Socioeconomic conditions of the state, and implications of these conditions for higher education
4. Analysis of a wide variety of topic areas
5. Supporting statistics and advisory studies
6. Integrated recommendations
7. Plans for implementation and simultaneous review of progress (Halstead, 1974: 21)

During the 1950's many states conducted surveys of higher education, but statewide planning as a formal activity dates to the California Master Plan of 1960. Since that time, nearly all states have developed a master plan. Some of this development was spurred by federal legislation, particularly Sections

1202 and 1203 of the Education Amendments of 1972 to the Higher Education Act of 1965. This legislation authorized states to designate and receive funds for a new or existing state agency with responsibilities for comprehensive postsecondary education planning. By 1975, all but four states had established 1202 commissions. Thirty-one states chose an existing agency or augmented an existing agency as the 1202 Commission, while fifteen states established new agencies. This federal initiative encouraged a development that was already well underway in the states and provided small amounts of federal funds to help in the process.

While statewide master planning was conceived and initiated in a period of higher education growth, current problems in higher education have to do with stability and even decline. It can be anticipated that controversies over centralization vs. institutional autonomy, as well as over the scope and content of master plans, will intensify as competition for state resources increases.

While there are many studies on statewide coordination and master planning, there have been few attempts at evaluating such efforts (Berdahl, 1975). Furthermore, no one approach to coordination and governance could be said to be superior to any other approach because "there is seemingly no known quantifiable consequence for actual operating results that can be associated with one or another approach to centralization of authority (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1976: 87)."

Patrick Callan (1975) highlights the problems of developing criteria for the evaluation of statewide boards, but finds it essential nonetheless. He suggests that the evaluation of such boards ought to begin with an evaluation of statewide planning because planning is an essential ingredient in the effectiveness of state boards. He suggests that both the Carnegie Commission's checklist on master plan contents and his own list of ten characteristics, listed in the following, be used as the basis for evaluation:

(1) Scope: Planning should encompass all of postsecondary education--public and private, academic and vocational.

(2) Participation: The process should encourage participation of all external and internal constituencies, including the general public, by such mechanisms as informal consultation, public hearings, advisory committees, and questionnaires. Participation should begin with the solicitation of opinions regarding the issues to be taken up in the planning process. It should include opportunities for reaction to preliminary findings and recommendations.

(3) Implementation: Responsibility for implementation of each recommendation should be made explicit.

(4) Information: The types of information which will be collected to monitor the implementation and success of the plan should be specified and responsibility for data collection should be established.

(5) Amendment: Provisions for revision should be incorporated in the plan.

(6) Reevaluation: A specific time for systematic review of the plan should be established.

(7) Integration: The relationship of the plan to the planning efforts of institutions and multicampus systems should be explained.

(8) Assumptions: Principles and assumptions upon which the plan is based should be articulated, including assumptions about societal trends, educational trends, and the learning process itself.

(9) Future agenda: Issues which surface in the planning process but are not dealt with in the plan should be listed.

(10) Incentives: Funding and administrative policies should be analyzed to assure that, at a minimum, they do not constitute disincentives to implementation of the plan; whenever possible, incentives for implementation should be provided (Callan, 1975: 22-23).

Thus, by the mid-1970's most states had established a statewide system of higher education and created a statewide board with responsibility for governance and/or coordination of the colleges and universities within the system. All states had recognized the importance of statewide planning for higher education and had initiated master plans under the auspices of a 1202 Commission, state board, or council for higher education. While higher education master plans differed from state to state, there was a growing consensus on the broad

areas to be covered in such plans. Finally, the need for evaluation of statewide coordination and master planning efforts was beginning to be recognized.

Coordination and Planning in Pennsylvania

The history of statewide coordination and master planning for higher education in Pennsylvania is unique in some respects, yet similar to patterns in other states in other respects. A State Council for Education was created in 1921 with responsibility for all education in Pennsylvania - elementary, secondary, and higher. But during most of its forty-two year life, this council was located within the Department of Public Instruction and served as an administrative rather than a policy-making board (Nelson, 1971, and Seavers, 1965).

In 1959, the Pennsylvania House of Representatives established a Committee on Education with membership appointed by the governor to study issues in basic and higher education. In 1961, this Committee, chaired by John Davis, submitted a comprehensive report which included a number of recommendations for higher education (Pennsylvania Department of Education, 1961a). Nearly all of these recommendations dealt with the problem of how to accommodate the greatly increasing numbers of students. The Committee recommended that (1) the state colleges should triple in size and convert to multipurpose institutions; (2) The Pennsylvania State University should expand to accommodate 35,000 students; (3) private institutions should expand enrollments; and (4) a system of community colleges should be established. In the area of governance, the Committee recommended that higher education should be separated as much as possible from basic education, while still remaining within the jurisdiction of the State Council of Education. They also recommended the formulation of an overall plan for higher education in the Commonwealth.

The governor's Committee of 100 for Better Education, established in anticipation of a change in administration, filed a report in 1961 that reiterated the Davis Committee emphasis on growth (Pennsylvania Dept. of Education, 1961b). It

recommended a separate State Council of Higher Education with responsibilities for study and policy in the field of higher education. This Council, together with one for basic education, would form the State Board of Education. The State Board would have final authority over all education policy in Pennsylvania.

In 1963, Act 94 amending Public Law 177 was signed into Pennsylvania law. It embodied the recommendations of the Committee of 100 by creating a State Board of Education, a Council of Basic Education, and a Council of Higher Education. The State Board of Education was given the power and duty to review the policies, standards, rules, and regulations formulated by each council and adopt broad policies and principles and establish standards governing the educational program of the Commonwealth. The Council of Higher Education was given the power and duty to (1) develop a master plan for higher education; (2) develop standards for higher education building projects involving the use of state funds; (3) review the annual budget requests from institutions of higher education; and (4) investigate programs, conduct research studies and formulate policy proposals in all areas pertaining to higher education.

This particular structure for higher education is rather unique, since Pennsylvania is one of only four states in which a Secretary of Education speaks for all of education, including higher education (Berve, 1975). In addition, there is a special relationship between the Secretary of Education and the state colleges and university system.

> In practice...the governance of the system rests primarily with the Governor's Office and the Secretary of Education. In addition to being charged with the responsibility of exercising policy leadership for all of Pennsylvania higher education, the Secretary of Education has been forced to operate as the de facto central administrator for the state colleges and university (State Board of Education, 1978: 23).

Pennsylvania is also unique in that the State Board of Education serves as a coordinating body for all of higher education in the Commonwealth. Furthermore, Pennsylvania is one of only seven states in which the agency for higher education has cabinet status (Berve, 1975).

The first official master plan for higher education in Pennsylvania was published in January 1967 (State Board of Education, 1967). The 1967 Master Plan addressed the problems of higher education growth, particularly growth in enrollments, programs, and finances. It also sought to define a Commonwealth System of Higher Education and defined missions for the state colleges, state-related universities, and community colleges.

However, the scope of the 1967 Master Plan was limited to public institutions of higher education, a limitation highlighted by Eulau and Quinley (1971). During 1960, these authors surveyed state officials in nine states including Pennsylvania. They concluded that greater statewide coordination as well as control of higher education planning and appropriations were needed in Pennsylvania. Eulau and Quinley found little communication between public and private institutions, and little policy initiative being taken either at the state cabinet or legislative levels in Pennsylvania. Commenting on the 1967 Master Plan, these authors concluded:

> To date, efforts to develop a more efficient, coordinated system of higher education in Pennsylvania have met with limited success. A master plan for state higher education prepared under a 1963 mandate from the General Assembly was completed by the State Board of Education in the fall of 1966. However, at the time of this report, only three of the board's recommendations had been implemented (Eulau and Quinley, 1971: 24).

The second master plan for higher education in Pennsylvania, published in 1971, began to look much more like other state master plans (State Board of Education, 1971). It included mission statements for each of the segments of higher education which were designated as part of the Commonwealth system of higher education. These segments included state-owned colleges and universities, Commonwealth universities, community colleges, independent institutions, and degree-granting proprietary schools (specialized associate degree-granting institutions). The 1971 Master Plan included basic goal statements, some demographic data and analyses, and specific attention to the questions of both coordination of the system and accountability within it. It also contained

special chapters on independent institutions, equalization of higher educational opportunity, and continuing education as well as specific recommendations for implementation.

Although it had not been recommended in the 1971 Master Plan, Act 224 was passed in October of 1972. This Act reaffirmed the Commonwealth's commitment to planning and requires a periodic Master Plan. Section 1317 (f) of the Act states:

> The State Board of Education shall adopt and periodically review and revise a master plan for higher education which shall be for the guidance of the Governor, the General Assembly, and all institutions of higher education financed wholly or in part from state appropriations. Such master plan shall (i) define the role of each type of institution (State-owned colleges and universities, State-related universities, community colleges, private colleges and universities and off-campus centers of any of these and other institutions authorized to grant degrees) in the Commonwealth System of Higher Education. (ii) recommend enrollment levels for each such institution, (iii) recommend a method of governance of the system, (iv) provide formulas for the distribution of State funds among the institutions, and (v) otherwise provide for an orderly development of the system.

Subsequent to the 1971 Master Plan and partly in response to it, a number of coordinating and planning mechanisms were initiated or strengthened. These included: (a) the creation of an Advisory Committee to the Council of Higher Education; (b) the establishment of eight regional higher education councils; and (c) the formation of a 1202 Commission consisting of members of the State Board of Education augmented by additional lay members. In addition, the Pennsylvania Association of Colleges and Universities (PACU) began to take a stronger stance on policy and planning issues.

In 1976, the State Board of Education initiated activities toward the development of a third master plan for higher education in Pennsylvania. Because Pennsylvania was one of the first states to move rapidly from a period of growth to one of stability - or in some instances decline - in enrollments, it was clear from the beginning that this master plan would have to accommodate to the new situation. On January 16, 1976, the State Board of Education passed

a resolution charging the Pennsylvania Postsecondary Education Planning Commission with developing a new master plan for higher education in Pennsylvania. The Commission invited the postsecondary educational community and interested organizations to identify the major master planning issues that needed to be addressed (Pennsylvania Postsecondary Education Planning Commission, 1978: Cover letter from Edward C. McGuire), and then established the following five Task Forces:

Task Force I Societal Needs and Educational Goals

Task Force II Equal Educational Opportunity and Quality Education

Task Force III Programs and Services

Task Force IV Delivery Systems

Task Force V Finance

The lengthy Task Force reports will not be reviewed as they are available throughout Pennsylvania. They were, however, extensively used in the preparation of the 1978 Master Plan. The four major themes underlying the recommendations included in The Master Plan for Higher Education in Pennsylvania - 1978 are stated in its introductory section (pp. 3-4):

> Excellence in higher education is the central theme of this Plan. Although academic excellence is an elusive concept, it is also very real. Commitment to excellence is of overriding concern, and has been the touchstone used to select highlights from the Task Force reports and to condense over a hundred Task Force recommendations into the recommendations and policies of this Plan.
>
> The structure of higher education is a second pervasive theme. The Master Plan stresses the need to strengthen the leadership role of the State Board of Education in establishing statewide educational policy. A stronger central presence is needed in Pennsylvania, but it must be achieved without threatening the values and contributions to economic and social progress derived from the historical diversity and independence of both the public and independent institutions.
>
> The need for program changes and realignment appears as a major theme at the intersection of demographic and economic trends. The theme stresses flexibility and program relevance for the student and for the Commonwealth.

Strengthening the support of higher education is a fourth pervasive theme. While due account must be taken of inflationary forces, the emphasis of this Master Plan is not only on the need for adequate funds but also on flexibility, timeliness and stability of funding.

Thus by 1978, Pennsylvania, following national patterns, had a Council of Higher Education and a State Board of Education with responsibility to plan and coordinate higher education in the state and to formulate state policy for higher education. Pennsylvania also had enacted legislation requiring the State Board of Education to develop and periodically review a master plan for higher education. Master plans were adopted in 1967, 1971, and 1978. In the context of this background for coordination and planning, Part II of this report reviews the six chapters and thirty-seven recommendations contained in The Master Plan for Higher Education in Pennsylvania - 1978, and concerns voiced by members of the higher education community during conferences conducted throughout Pennsylvania to discuss implementation of the 1978 Master Plan.

PART II

REGIONAL CONFERENCES ON IMPLEMENTATION OF THE 1978 MASTER PLAN

Overview of Conferences

The Master Plan for Higher Education in Pennsylvania - 1978 was adopted by the Pennsylvania State Board of Education in November, 1978, and forwarded by its Chairman to Governor Thornburgh on January 16, 1979. The first recommendation of the 1978 Master Plan reaffirmed the commitment of the State Board of Education to an ongoing planning process and, in subpart A (p.23) requested the regional coordinating councils "... to review the Master Plan and forward to the State Board of Education comments with respect to regional objectives..." In partial fulfillment of this recommendation, the Pennsylvania 1202 Commission offered funds to eight regional councils so that each could hold a conference on implementation of the 1978 Master Plan. From the funding proposals submitted to the 1202 Commission and from opening remarks of the council chairmen at each conference, it is clear that all conferences had purposes very similar to those outlined in the Southwestern Pennsylvania Higher Education Council's proposal, namely, "... to bring together institutional, regional, departmental, and legislative representatives to discuss, plan, and recommend with respect to implementation of The Master Plan for Higher Education in Pennsylvania." Each council also indicated that a report summarizing regional reactions to the 1978 Master Plan and commenting on regional priorities for implementation would be prepared.

One important event occurred in Pennsylvania between the initial plans for the regional conferences and the conferences themselves. The Democratic administration, under which the 1978 Master Plan had been developed, was replaced by a Republican administration. While the original goals of the regional conferences

were discussion and planning for implementation of the 1978 Master Plan, the change in administration led also to the use of the conferences as a forum for dialogue between the new state officials and members of the higher education community.

Conferences were scheduled as follows:

Region	Regional Council	Location	Date
1	Delaware Valley Planning Council	Philadelphia	April 26, 1979
2	Higher Education Planning Council	Bethlehem	March 9, 1979
3	Northeastern Pennsylvania Regional Planning Council for Higher Education	Wilkes-Barre	March 29, 1979
4	Region 4 Planning Council	State College	March 16, 1979
5	Northwestern Pennsylvania Planning Council for Higher Education	Erie	April 6, 1979
6	Capitol Region Planning Council	Shippensburg	April 25, 1979
7	Council of Higher Education	Altoona	February 23, 1979
8	Southwestern Pennsylvania Higher Education Council, Inc.	Pittsburgh	March 22, 1979

All conferences lasted for a day and seven of the eight followed a similar format. In the morning, three or four speakers traced the history and background of the 1978 Master Plan and reviewed its recommendations, usually according to the agency with implementation responsibility (e.g., State Board of Education, General Assembly, regional councils, institutions of higher education, etc.). In each instance the speakers included the Chairman of the 1202 Commission (Mr. Arthur Sinkler); a representative from the Pennsylvania Department of Education (Dr. Samuel Craig, Acting Assistant Commissioner for Higher Education, and/or Mr. Warren Ringler, Commissioner of Higher Education, and/or Dr. Robert Scanlon, Secretary of Education, and/or Dr. Elisabeth Jordan, Coordinator for Regionalization); the Executive Director of the Pennsylvania Association of Colleges and Universities (Dr. James Ream); and usually someone from the region who had been extensively involved in the development of the 1978 Master

Plan (e.g., Dr. Jack Freeman, University of Pittsburgh; or Dr. Herman Niebuhr, Temple University). Also during the morning, an additional one to three speakers reacted to the 1978 Master Plan and commented on implementation from the point of view of institutional sectors (e.g., state-owned, state-related, community colleges, independent, and proprietary) within the region. Usually a short question period allowed participants to address questions to any morning speaker.

In the afternoon, participants were given an opportunity to comment on the 1978 Master Plan. In the larger conferences, small groups were organized and assigned specific recommendations or chapters for discussion. Following these small group sessions, a wrap-up session was held for reporting to the total group. Although the participants met as a whole in the smaller conferences, discussion leaders encouraged participation from all those present. The only exception to this general format was the Region 4 conference in which there were three panels and no small group discussions.

Five of the regions used similar questionnaires to ascertain reactions to the 1978 Master Plan recommendations. These questionnaires contained a complete list of all the recommendations contained in the 1978 Master Plan. Respondents were asked to check whether each recommendation was "desirable to implement," "neutral," or "not desirable to implement," or to provide some form of prioritization. However, there were differences as to how the instruments were administered and used. In one region, the questionnaire was mailed to institutions before the conference. In that region, the respondents often differed from the conference participants. In another region, it was administered early in the day and used to organize the discussion during the conference. In other regions, participants were surveyed at the end of the day or after the conference and the results were used as a source of additional information for the report of the regional council. Because of these differences in administration, the tabulated responses are not totally comparable measures of regional response

to the 1978 Master Plan. The survey information is, however, sufficiently informative that it is included in this report to supplement comments made during conference discussions.

Participation at the various conferences varied from approximately thirty-five (Shippensburg) to ninety-five (Philadelphia). Often the conferences with fewer participants had a larger number of regional institutions represented than did the conferences with larger attendance. For example, the Region 7 conference was attended by approximately sixty people, including the presidents of all seven regional colleges and universities. The Delaware Valley Regional Council conference on the other hand, had ninety-five participants, but only forty-two of the seventy-nine regional institutions were represented. Participants at most conferences included a substantial number of presidents or high-ranking officers representing the president, other administrators from colleges and universities in the region, a small number of legislators or legislative staff members, four or five representatives from the Pennsylvania Department of Education, and a few reporters or other media representatives. While it was difficult to judge the reactions of the regional council chairmen, most seemed pleased with the participation and interest evidenced during the conferences.

Following the conferences, the chairmen of the regional councils met as a group to exchange information, and each council submitted a report to the State Board of Education. The reports summarized regional reactions to the 1978 Master Plan and commented on regional priorities for implementation. (Pennsylvania Department of Education, 1979).

In summary, the eight regional conferences on implementation of the 1978 Master Plan were:

a. designed to be an integral part of the Pennsylvania planning process as stipulated in the 1978 Master Plan itself;

b. intended to provide information on the 1978 Master Plan and suggestions for implementation to colleges and universities, regional councils, and the State Board of Education;

c. used for regional discussion, comment, and planning with respect to implementation consistent with the regional emphasis outlined in the 1978 Master Plan;

d. used as a forum for a dialogue on higher education planning between a new state administration and representatives of the higher education community in Pennsylvania.

Reactions to the 1978 Master Plan

This section summarizes the presentations and discussions that occurred in all eight conferences. It follows the ordering of chapters and recommendations in the document entitled, The Master Plan for Higher Education in Pennsylvania - 1978, rather than the format of any of the conferences. Much of the detail has been omitted in an effort to provide an overview of the general reactions to the 1978 Master Plan and its recommendations.[1]

The first two chapters of the document, along with its introduction, provide the background and general assumptions on which the 1978 Master Plan is based. Subsequent chapters contain the 1978 Master Plan's recommendations. While each recommendation is summarized briefly in this section, the full text of all recommendations included in the 1978 Master Plan is reproduced in the appendix to this report.

Chapter 1 - The Educational Environment of the Eighties

Chapter 1 of the 1978 Master Plan presents some projections about the environment of the 1980's that will affect higher education in Pennsylvania.

[1] Copies of the reports submitted to each regional council chairman following the conference held in his region are available upon request from the Institute for Higher Education, University of Pittsburgh.

It paints a gloomy picture, reporting trends that indicate a 24% decrease between 1975 and 1990 in the traditional-age student group, a decrease which will be offset only partially by increases in part-time adult students. With respect to manpower needs in Pennsylvania, the 1978 Master Plan reports projections made by the U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics that between 1978 and 1985 there will be 7.7 million jobs requiring a college degree and 10.4 million graduates available for those jobs. It concludes from this that there will be underemployment, rather than unemployment, of college graduates. Chapter 1 also describes those economic conditions in Pennsylvania that are likely to severely hamper higher education: inflation, collective bargaining, increased competition for resources both with other parts of the public service sector and other parts of the postsecondary education sector; and increased costs of compliance with applicable federal and state regulations.

There was extensive discussion during all conferences about the anticipated environment for higher education in the 1980's. Strengthening the economy of Pennsylvania was mentioned as the new governor's major priority in each conference. Thus, the link between higher education and both economic and industrial development was a main topic of discussion. It was clear to all that the basic health of Pennsylvania's economy would have a direct and significant impact on the amount of resources available for the support of higher education in Pennsylvania and, therefore, would affect the quality and diversity of educational programs, perhaps even to the extent of determining institutional survival. Most institutional representatives felt that the current positive impact of higher education on the economy is little recognized. There was widespread support for an economic impact study to be undertaken by the Pennsylvania Economy League at the initiative of PACU. There was also general discussion of how colleges and universities might help to promote

economic development in the future. Dr. Craig and others encouraged an active role for higher education, although no specific suggestions for ways of implementing this activity were mentioned in any of the conferences. It was announced in Region 1 that a Task Force had been established to study ways of strengthening the relationship between the higher education and business communities, and that recommendations resulting from this study would be forwarded to the regional council.

Enrollment projections were also discussed in each of the conferences. Mr. Sinkler and others often noted that it had been enormously difficult to get institutional representatives to "face the facts of the demographics." Only Region 6 related projected enrollment declines to the question of institutional closings. Commissioner Ringler and several institutional representatives noted that Pennsylvania is losing students to other states, and that often Pennsylvania students can attend institutions in neighboring states at lower cost. Several persons suggested that a fundamental change in state policy was necessary to allow for vastly increased state support to colleges and universities. Only such a change, they argued, would enable the reductions in tuition levels necessary for full access and the elimination or decrease of the out-migration of Pennsylvania students. Others supported Recommendation 7 (p. 29) as another means of providing access and increasing enrollments. Institutional representatives apparently felt that if part-time students were eligible for PHEAA (Pennsylvania Higher Education Assistance Agency) grants, and if the total PHEAA grant fund were increased to make these new grants possible, then enrollment increases could be achieved.

The manpower needs projections in Chapter 1 received little attention during the conferences. Apparently, conferees were willing to accept the accuracy of the data sources on which the projections were based. However, a recurring

criticism at the regional conferences concerned the perceived failure of the 1978 Master Plan to include recommendations responsive to the enrollment and employment projections outlined in Chapter 1. It is interesting to note that several of Secretary of Education Scanlon's reported criticisms of the 1978 Master Plan concerned its failure to address the implications of declining enrollments for the financial solvency of institutions or to show the relationship between enrollment trends in academic programs and projected manpower needs in Pennsylvania. These same concerns with the 1978 Master Plan were cited by a number of institutional representatives during the course of the conferences.

The problems of inflation and increased costs of compliance with various federal and state regulations were discussed and recognized as enormously important to colleges and universities in the Commonwealth. In one conference, Dr. Craig reported efforts on the part of the Pennsylvania Department of Education to minimize paper work and reporting requirements. There appeared to be a positive response to this initiative.

Chapter 2 - Goals of Higher Education

Chapter 2 of the 1978 Master Plan addresses the goals of higher education in Pennsylvania. It points out the difficulty of systematically assessing societal and individual needs that are constantly changing. Consequently, it is hard to establish appropriate higher education goals. Nonetheless, it asserts the importance of developing appropriate responses:

> The pace of change in the substance of societal and individual need is such that earlier patterns of responsiveness are now inadequate. For higher education to retain its vitality and legitimacy, a more explicit, deliberate and systematic method of defining needs and aspirations is required (p. 16).

The basic thrust of the 1978 Master Plan is then summarized as follows:

> Higher education in Pennsylvania must strengthen its ability to meet these and other societal needs. The promotion of the imaginative and critical acquisition of knowledge and skills, the transmission of the cultural heritage, the search for the appropriate application of new knowledge, and the clarification of societal, institutional and personal values remain among its fundamental goals (p. 16).

The chapter also establishes the goals of the State Board of Education for higher education in the following areas: (1) quality education; (2) access; (3) governance and coordination; (4) educational programs; (5) supportive services; (6) generation and application of knowledge; (7) continuing renewal; (8) the Commonwealth system of higher education; and (9) commitment of public support.

There was little discussion during the conferences on Chapter 2, and only in Region 6 were participants asked if they found the State Board of Education's goals appropriate for Pennsylvania. In that region, it was generally agreed that these were the appropriate goals, although several participants commented on their lack of specificity. Since participants in other regions did not challenge these goals, it is reasonable to assume they also felt that the goals described in Chapter 2 were appropriate for higher education in Pennsylvania.

Chapter 3 - The Commonwealth System of Higher Education

This chapter of the 1978 Master Plan describes the system of higher education in Pennsylvania and establishes the missions of each of the five sectors (i.e., community colleges, state-owned colleges and university, state-related universities, independent colleges and universities, and specialized associate degree granting institutions). The chapter contains recommendations in the areas of statewide planning and governance. During the conferences there was some discussion of the mission statements for the various sectors of higher education. Noting the similarity of all mission statements, some participants suggested that the health of the system required more distinctive missions for each of the segments. A small number of participants from the community college sector opposed the provisions for the award of associate degrees in the mission statements of both the state-owned colleges and university and the state-related universities. Others noted and applauded the fact that

the mission statements gave each sector maximum flexibility to define its own mission and to pursue purposes desired by that sector.

Recommendation 1 addresses responsibilities and activities in statewide planning, and calls for comments from institutions of higher education and regional coordinating councils. It was discussed extensively in all conferences and provided for an important dialogue between the new Pennsylvania Secretary of Education and the higher education community. During the first several conferences, speakers and participants revealed some confusion over who to blame, praise, or hold responsible for the 1978 Master Plan. Mr. Sinkler and representatives from the Pennsylvania Department of Education gave generally positive reactions to the 1978 Master Plan, but accepted no responsibility for preparing it. Institutional representatives, on the other hand, responded as if the 1978 Master Plan had been written by officials in the Pennsylvania Department of Education. In later conferences, Mr. Sinkler and Dr. Craig emphasized that the 1978 Master Plan had been drafted primarily by representatives of colleges and universities in Pennsylvania, not by the Pennsylvania Department of Education.

Secretary Scanlon's position on the 1978 Master Plan was reported to participants in all eight regional conferences and can be summarized as follows. First, the Secretary thinks that the 1978 Master Plan represents a positive effort on the part of institutions of higher education and reflects policy of the State Board of Education. He acknowledges that it is a reasonable first step covering some of the planning areas mandated in state law. However, it does not do in a wholly satisfactory way such things as:

a. establish a distinctive mission for each sector of postsecondary education in Pennsylvania;

b. elaborate on enrollment declines and the implications for financial solvency of institutions;

c. address future directions; directions for graduate and professional education;

d. relate preparation programs to the work of graduates in the marketplace or to manpower needs in Pennsylvania;

e. plan for continuing education;

f. provide for articulation between basic education and postsecondary education;

g. include all of postsecondary education; and

h. assess the impact of changing life-styles on postsecondary education.

Many of the same criticisms of the 1978 Master Plan were voiced by institutional representatives, particularly in the earlier conferences, although many other participants seemed to disagree with the Secretary's position. A few participants noted that it would be unreasonable and not in the best interest of colleges and universities to expect more than a general statement of policy objectives. The most common theme from institutional participants was that it is important to maintain the unique educational traditions of Pennsylvania and to ensure an integral or even dominant role for colleges and universities in the planning process. Institutions clearly wanted to be involved in planning for implementation of the 1978 Master Plan. In the dialogue on planning many of the specifics of Recommendation 1 were lost, but in general, participants appeared to take this first recommendation as a given, not as a matter of choice, and to concentrate their efforts on obtaining institutional participation in the process of statewide planning.

In all conferences there was extensive discussion on governance and on the appropriate balance between state control and institutional autonomy. This emphasis may have developed from the process of developing the 1978 Master Plan, since early drafts had called for a more strongly centralized system of higher education in Pennsylvania by recommending increased power and authority

for the State Board of Education and/or the regional councils. Many of the institutional representatives praised the traditions of diversity and autonomy in Pennsylvania and argued for the continuation of these traditions, even while they recognized that greater coordination was inevitable. Mr. Sinkler and Pennsylvania Department of Education personnel repeatedly noted that the responsibility for facing the problems and opportunities of the future rests with the individual institutions, the sectors, and the regional councils rather than with the Pennsylvania Department of Education, the State Board of Education or "Harrisburg." They, too, appeared to support the strongly decentralized system in Pennsylvania. Only one participant asked, rhetorically, if the overall governance system in Pennsylvania was appropriate and suggested a statewide governing board devoted exclusively to all higher education institutions. All others appeared to accept the system as described in the 1978 Master Plan, including the roles outlined for the State Board of Education, the Pennsylvania Department of Education, the regional councils, and the five sectors of higher education.

Strong support was voiced for Recommendation 2, calling for a governance reorganization for the state colleges and university sector. Representatives from institutions in this sector spoke on behalf of this recommendation; other participants did not comment during the conferences. Dr. Ream informed the Philadelphia conference participants that legislation (SB 452) had been introduced in the State Senate to accomplish this recommendation, but that institutional backing was still needed for successful passage and that PACU has endorsed the legislation. The survey instruments showed mixed findings on Recommendation 2. It was clear that many respondents from the other higher education sectors felt that it was inappropriate to take a position on this recommendation. Region 2 respondents showed some support, but also some reservations, and many respondents in Region 8 expressed reservations.

Recommendation 3, which calls for regional coordination, was discussed extensively in all but one of the regions. There were two points of general consensus: (1) regionalization is a "good" thing provided that it remains voluntary; and (2) increased activity on the part of the regions will require increased resources. One participant described the situation as a choice between voluntary regional coordination in which the institutions clearly dominate, and unilateral prescription from Harrisburg. Most participants agreed that the regional councils will have to become active in new areas in the future, and many argued for increased sharing of information among regions as well as among institutions within regions. Some concern was expressed that regionalization might mean another layer of bureaucracy. There were also some requests for clarification of the role of the regions in planning and coordination. Mr. Sinkler stressed the importance of the regional councils for implementation of the 1978 Master Plan. While all agreed that additional resources were needed to support the activities of the regional councils, some felt that these resources should come from the state, while others argued that such dependence on Harrisburg would alter the voluntary and autonomous nature of the regional councils. Many felt that the regional councils should not dictate to institutions or become a "court of last resort."

There was little discussion of Recommendation 4 (continuance of an Advisory Committee to the Council of Higher Education) in the first four regional conferences, although available surveys indicated that participants considered it "desirable to implement." At the Southwestern Pennsylvania and subsequent conferences, Mr. Sinkler reported the plans of the Council of Higher Education for the composition of the Advisory Committee: one member from each of the state-related, state-aided, state-owned, community college, independent, and specialized associate degree-granting sectors. Only a few participants (among a group largely made up of

administrators) felt that faculty and/or students ought to be included among the membership of the Advisory Committee. In the Delaware Valley Regional conference, Dr. Ream noted that the PACU supports the Council of Higher Education plan.

Chapter 4 - Equal Opportunity and Access to Higher Education

This chapter of the 1978 Master Plan reaffirms the commitment of the State Board of Education to equal opportunity for all citizens of Pennsylvania and emphasizes that this commitment can only be realized through public policy which provides access to higher education. The chapter defines access in terms of financial access, student assistance, geographical access, physical access, and access for women and minorities who have been traditionally underrepresented. It includes recommendations on levels of state support, on the Pennsylvania Higher Assistance Agency (PHEAA), on support for part-time students, on regional planning, on the development of the community college system, and on opportunities for the handicapped, for women, and for minorities. Widespread agreement with the general thrust of Chapter 4 was evident in all regional conferences.

Recommendation 5 calls for the annual upward adjustment of state support for public institutions of higher education to ensure that tuition increases would not exceed the general rate of inflation. In all conferences this was commonly referred to as the "indexing" recommendation. Reactions to it were mixed. Many participants supported indexing and noted Pennsylvania's low support for higher education in comparison with other states. They also commented on the already severe impact of inflation and other cost increases on the quality of programs. They argued that Recommendation 5 is one of the few 1978 Master Plan recommendations in which the State Board of Education goes on record in support of increased state resources for higher education. Others

argued in favor of increased state support, but had misgivings about the indexing method. They believed that indexing would not provide sufficient resources to deal with the serious financial problems facing the colleges and universities of Pennsylvania. One participant in Region 6 felt that the 1978 Master Plan should recommend that the state bear a certain fixed percentage of the total costs of higher education for each of the five sectors of higher education, thereby also establishing a fixed percentage for students to pay through tuition. Several participants were convinced that indexing for public institutions would increase tuition differences between public and independent institutions, thereby exacerbating the financial problems of independent institutions. In surveys conducted in two regions, Recommendation 5 was considered "undesirable to implement," while in other surveys no consensus emerged.

Dr. Ream noted in most regions that while he considered the recommendation important from a policy perspective and therefore appropriate for inclusion in the 1978 Master Plan, he nonetheless considered it unrealistic for implementation by the Pennsylvania General Assembly. He pointed out that the General Assembly is constrained by revenues, not inflation, and that similar indexing requests from other agencies in the public sector have not been honored by the General Assembly.

Recommendation 6 suggests various improvements in the administration of student financial aid. There was little discussion of this recommendation except that Dr. Ream mentioned in each of the conferences the importance of Subpart D which calls for a standardized calendar for financial aid applications and decisions. He noted that a bill that would have accomplished these changes had been passed by the General Assembly in 1978, but that it was vetoed by then Governor Shapp. He felt that similar legislation would fare better under Governor Thornburgh.

Recommendation 7 calls upon the General Assembly to provide support to part-time students through a redefinition of financial aid eligibility and increased resources to PHEAA. This recommendation was discussed extensively in all conferences and received strong support from institutional representatives. As noted earlier, many felt that its implementation would have a positive effect on enrollments. Dr. Ream informed participants that PHEAA estimates of the cost of implementation ranged from five to eleven million dollars. Several conference participants noted that implementation should be dependent on the provision of increased state resources for PHEAA so that financial assistance for part-time students would not come "at the expense of" full-time students. Some legislative participants appeared interested in this recommendation.

Recommendations 8, 9, and 10 were usually grouped together for purposes of discussion. They ask the regional councils to develop ways to provide for unmet geographical access needs, and also ask the Postsecondary Education Planning Commission (1202) to determine ways to reach the urban and rural disadvantaged, as well as to determine areas for future community college development. Many conferees commented that a needs assessment represented a new kind of activity for the regional councils and wondered whether they were the appropriate agencies for such activity. Most councils seemed willing to undertake such studies, provided that the necessary resources were made available. One participant commented on the "potential" for discovering new student "markets" through needs assessments. Many participants wanted clarification of Subpart B of Recommendation 10 which calls for the development of contractual arrangements between the Department of Education and institutions. Mr. Sinkler noted in all conferences that full development of the planned community college system of twenty-eight institutions was unlikely. Participants seemed relieved

to learn that the community college system would not be expanded. Finally, many participants argued that the regional councils should be given the authority as well as the responsibility to determine what needs exist in each region and how best to serve them.

Recommendation 11 encourages all institutions to provide transition courses and programs to help disadvantaged and handicapped students. It recommends the development of a statewide approach to providing educational access for handicapped persons, and thus it commits the state to seek an amendment to Section 504 of the Federal Rehabilitation Act. Most participants seemed unaware of the implications of Section 504 for colleges and universities in Pennsylvania. Discussion of this recommendation served, for the most part, to inform participants of the position of the State Board of Education on this matter.

Recommendation 12 calls upon institutions to encourage entry of women and minorities into higher education, and to seek to improve retention rates. It also calls upon the Commonwealth to continue to support and strengthen the role of traditionally black institutions in the state system. There was little discussion of this recommendation. Survey responses were mixed, with one region showing a large number of votes in the "not desirable to implement" category for Subparts 12b and 12c. One participant was astounded that the 1978 Master Plan did not contain information on the numbers of women and minoritity faculty and students, and that more attention had not been given to the traditionally black institutions in Pennsylvania.

Chapter 5 - Academic Quality and Educational Opportunity

This chapter defines academic quality and provides a list of criteria for measuring the level of quality of an institution. It also includes a number of recommendations calling for institutional actions in the areas of general

education, graduate and professional education, adult and continuing education, counseling, research, transfer of credit among institutions, and articulation with basic education. Conference participants accorded these recommendations high priority and, for the most part, supported their implementation. Dr. Craig commented on the importance of the quality recommendations in most conferences. He noted that national studies indicate that students view quality considerations as the primary criterion for the selection of a college or university. One participant said that Chapter 5 calls upon institutions "to do more of everything better," but colleges and universities find this impossible in a period of constrained and even decreasing resources. Many participants found fault with the 1978 Master Plan for failing to prioritize recommendations in this chapter. Others disagreed, noting that the 1978 Master Plan is, by definition, a broad policy document and that the determination of priorities should be left to colleges and universities in Pennsylvania. While it is difficult to determine with precision, it seemed that the former view was held by a majority of the participants.

Recommendation 13 reaffirms the commitment of the State Board of Education to academic excellence and recommends that institutions define quality criteria, search for ways to improve quality, seek demonstrated competence from students, and develop standards allowing for credit for acquired knowledge. Most participants supported this recommendation although a few commented that the accreditation associations are the appropriate agencies to judge academic quality. A few also challenged the idea of credit for "life experience" and called for clarification of this subpart of the recommendation.

Recommendation 14 calls upon institutions to strengthen the quality of undergraduate programs and, more specifically, to strengthen general education programs and correct skill deficiencies. Region 7 detected an implication that

quality did not currently characterize higher education in Pennsylvania and urged a change in the wording to suggest that institutions "continue to improve quality." A few participants felt that this recommendation interfered in "an institutional matter." In Region 8 participants discussed the problems of adequately defining general education as well as the respective roles of secondary and postsecondary institutions in correcting skill deficiencies. Participants in Region 8 agreed that if an institution accepts students with skill deficiencies, then that institution has an obligation to attempt to correct them.

Recommendation 15 states that the State Board of Education will develop guidelines for the periodic review of all programs for which the Board has review authority. Surprisingly, this recommendation was not discussed in the conferences. It may be that it was overlooked because it was not accompanied by supporting comment in the plan and was placed among many recommendations calling for institutional action.

Recommendation 16 calls upon institutions to provide for global education through a variety of means, and Recommendation 17 encourages institutional use of new modes of instruction. Neither recommendation was extensively discussed although the few comments and the questionnaires indicated support for both. Region 7 showed the strongest support for Recommendation 16 and urged the State Board of Education to further it. Region 8 gave Recommendation 17 a low priority, while Region 2 felt that this recommendation spoke to an area of critical need.

Recommendation 18 recommends that the General Assembly provide the financial support essential to maintain and improve the system of graduate and professional education in Pennsylvania and to maintain tuition policies that ensure access to these programs. The importance of this recommendation,

particularly for the health-related fields, was emphasized by several of the speakers. Dr. Ream noted that it was a generalized recommendation that would not be easily translated into specific legislation by the General Assembly. There was little discussion during the conferences on this recommendation although opposition was expressed in Region 5. In the Region 7 survey, Recommendation 18 received one of the highest numbers (23) of "low priority for implementation" responses.

Recommendation 19, which speaks to continuing education, was generally supported by conference participants, particularly Subpart B which states that the resources of existing institutions and programs should be utilized for continuing education purposes. As usual, the question of costs was raised by participants. The new Compact for Life-long Educational Opportunities (CLEO) Project in the Delaware Valley region was praised by all participants in that conference and suggested as a model for other regions. The CLEO Project involves coordinated planning for continuing education programs within the region.

Recommendation 20 dealing with curricular and career counseling was also generally supported, but there were a few negative reactions and some requests for clarification. Many participants described activities currently underway and seemed to resent the implication that colleges and universities do not currently provide adequate counseling services. Many pointed out the need for clarification of the recommendation calling for a statewide system of educational counseling and information services.

Recommendation 21 calls for recognition of the importance of academic research. It was supported by many participants. A few conferees related this recommendation to the discussion of the Governor's priorities for economic development in the Commonwealth and suggested that more specifics and detail

in the recommendation would have been desirable. Still others took some offense at the notion that only the universities possess the research capabilities to aid the Commonwealth, and argued on behalf of the contributions of the four-year institutions and community colleges.

Recommendation 22 suggests various actions for institutions and regional councils to ensure equitable standards for student transfers among institutions. Many participants noted that such activities are already underway within both institutions and regions, and felt that the recommendation was not really needed. Others seemed generally supportive, although not overly interested.

Recommendation 23 calls upon the Council of Basic Education and the Council of Higher Education of the State Board of Education to work together for improved integration between secondary and postsecondary curricula. A few participants noted the importance of better preparation in the high schools, but this recommendation received little attention and discussion. Survey responses revealed support for it.

Chapter 6 - Financing Higher Education

This chapter of the 1978 Master Plan concerns issues of financing Pennsylvania's system of higher education. It provides background information on support for higher education in Pennsylvania as compared to other states and concludes that:

> ...the Commonwealth has failed to utilize its tax base capacity to fund public higher educational institutions in a manner comparable to that of other progressive industrial states. As a result, tuition at public institutions has been permitted to rise to one of the highest levels in the nation, needed programs have been cut back, and access to higher education had been jeopardized for many Pennsylvanians (p. 45).

The chapter comments and recommends on support for each sector of higher education in Pennsylvania; contains suggestions for the General Assembly relative to the appropriations process; comments on possibilities for statewide budget

formulas; recommends increased support for research and financial aid; calls for improved management practices; recommends a moratorium on institutions, campuses, and centers; and suggests control of the costs of compliance with federal and state statutes.

Participants in all eight regional conferences clearly felt that issues of finance are of utmost importance to higher education in Pennsylvania. There was universal agreement with the assertion in the 1978 Master Plan that Pennsylvania could do more to support higher education. There was, however, considerable diversity of opinion on the specific recommendations in Chapter 6.

In all conferences, Dr. Ream and other speakers elaborated on Recommendation 24 which calls for a constitutional amendment to require earlier action by the General Assembly on appropriations for higher education institutions. He reminded participants of the problems encountered by state-related and other "nonpreferred" institutions during the budget battle of 1977. While the recommendation did not apply to the institutions represented by many conference participants, most supported its implementation. In the last three conferences, Dr. Ream noted that legislation (HB 158) has been introduced to accomplish this recommendation, although some minor problems with the language remain.

Recommendation 25 calls, among other things, for the establishment of a task force to develop formula funding approaches for higher education appropriations. This recommendation was discussed at length in all conferences. Graduate Dean Bartoo of The Pennsylvania State University provided the most comprehensive statement of the difficulties associated with formula funding. He noted the problems of translating quality into quantifiable measures, of justifying high cost but essential programs, and of distinguishing between activity indicators and productivity indicators. Other participants felt that formula funding is inevitable for Pennsylvania and concentrated on trying to

ensure a voice for institutional representatives in decisions about formula methods. Two regional surveys reported opposition to this recommendation while reservations were expressed in other surveys.

Secretary Scanlon was praised for his decision to ask PACU for suggestions of individuals to serve on the formula-funding task force. At the later conferences, Dr. Ream noted this fact and informed participants that PACU had supplied the Secretary with a list of names. The preference of Secretary Scanlon and Department of Education personnel for quantitative measures and, as Dr. Ream put it, "factually-based demonstrated need," was made clear to all participants.

Recommendation 26 recommends a method of support for the community college system wherein the state supports one-third of the total operational costs and one-half of capital costs, while other costs are shared by the state, the sponsor, and the student. It also recommends that funding levels be indexed for inflationary cost increases. Community college representatives informed other participants that the state currently pays considerably less than one-third of the operational costs of community colleges because of the current support ceiling per full-time equivalent (FTE) student. Participants from community colleges supported this recommendation and other participants did not oppose it during the conferences, but in the surveys, it received a surprisingly large number of votes indicating that it was "not desirable to implement."

Recommendation 27 calls for "indexing" of state support for the state-owned and state-related institutions. Since it was generally discussed in conjunction with Recommendation 5, most comments closely paralleled those already mentioned for Recommendation 5.

Recommendation 28 calls for increased levels of funding to state-related medical schools, and for program support in areas of medicine, dentisty, public

health, veterinary medicine, optometry, and podiatric medicine. Responses to this recommendation tended to parallel those for Recommendation 18.

Recommendation 29 calls for a special commission to clarify public issues related to funding for state-aided institutions. While there was little discussion of this recommendation during the conferences, it received mixed reactions in the surveys. Many responses were neutral, while others stated that it was of "low priority for implementation."

Recommendation 30 supports the continuation of the Institutional Assistance Grants (IAG) program administered by PHEAA as the primary method of providing state support for independent institutions. It suggests that support levels should be increased through indexing to inflation rates. Participants noted that IAG levels had not been increased in many years. Most supported this method of support for independent institutions, and argued strongly for the need for increases in grant levels.

Recommendation 31 calls for state support to specialized associate degree granting institutions in one of two ways: directly, through IAG grants for nonprofit-making institutions; and, indirectly, through loans to students for profit-making institutions. This recommendation received little attention from the majority of participants, but in each conference a small number of representatives from this sector described their unique role in higher education and argued for more attention to their problems in the 1978 Master Plan. Participants from profit-making proprietary institutions felt that these institutions should also be eligible for Institutional Assistance Grants.

Recommendation 32 advocates financial support for research in science, arts and humanities. It was not discussed very much but was generally, although not universally, supported.

Recommendation 33 addresses state capital funding and recommends an emphasis on repair and renovation, as well as the provision of emergency grants or loans for essential repairs. This recommendation received little discussion, although all those who did comment felt that it was vitally important. It received a large number of "high priority for implementation" votes in the surveys.

Recommendation 34 asks the Pennsylvania Higher Education Assistance Agency Board of Directors to develop a system whereby the family income limitations, and the size of individual student grants could be adjusted annually in relation to inflation. This recommendation was treated primarily as an information item. Dr. Ream reported that the PHEAA is considering both items. Strong support for this recommendation was evidenced in the surveys.

Recommendation 35 suggests that institutions improve their management controls and increase the efficiency of their operations. A few participants argued that efficiency gains have long since been achieved and, therefore, exhausted as a means of further economies. Most, however, recognized the validity of this recommendation. Participants in the Delaware Valley regional meeting discussed the difficulties experienced by small institutions which do not have specialized staff for management studies and suggested that PACU and/or the Department of Education help implement this recommendation by identifying management consultant teams. The teams could be requested by colleges and universities to undertake special services and studies.

Recommendation 36 suggests a moratorium on new campuses, institutions, or centers in Pennsylvania. It was discussed in all conferences and broadly supported. Many noted that "regions should be given the opportunity to meet every educational need before other new institutions are considered for the region." Others spoke of the need for "strengthening current institutions

instead of creating new ones." Some participants wanted clarification of the subparts calling for a resource data bank and cooperative counsulting service. There was no comment on the subpart recommending a process for reclassifying institutions.

Perhaps the recommendation which received the strongest support was Recommendation 37, which calls upon governmental agencies to carefully examine the costs to higher educational institutions of compliance associated with statutes and regulations, with a view toward reducing those burdens insofar as possible, and toward eliminating redundance in reporting and record-keeping requirements. Many believed that "we are being consumed by our own nonproductive efforts because of too much regulation, compliance, and reporting." While others felt that the high cost of "meeting regulations for handicapped students was too burdensome" for some institutions, some supported the notion of statewide compliance. Recommendation 6, concerning the need for improvements in the administration of student financial aid, was often discussed in concert with Recommendation 37. Many believe that the duplication, redundancy, and lack of standardization needlessly increased institutional costs.

Summary of Responses to the 1978 Master Plan Recommendations

The eight regional conferences on implementation of the 1978 Master Plan were used for dialogue between the higher education community and the Secretary of Education. Participants tended to use the 1978 Master Plan conferences as a springboard for discussion on the enrollment and financial problems ahead for higher education institutions and worked to persuade the new Secretary of Education to become a strong advocate for increased support for higher education.

The subjects which received the most attention during the conferences were planning, governance, regionalization, and finance. On the whole, participants supported the recommendations in the 1978 Master Plan in these areas, but there

were differences of opinion on specifics and priorities. Taking both the conferees' comments and the surveys into account, responses to the recommendations can be categorized as follows:

A. Recommendations found desirable to implement: 1, 6, 7, 14, 36a, 37.

In this group, Recommendations 7, 36a, and 37 received the strongest support.

B. Recommendations of considerable interest, but mixed opinions concerning desirability for implementation: 2, 3, 5, 10, 11, 13, 16, 17, 20, 22, 25.

In this group, the strongest mixed opinions concerned Recommendations 5 and 25.

C. Recommendations of both more limited interest and mixed opinions concerning desirability for implementation: 24, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35.

D. Recommendations which generated neither much interest nor much discussion: 4, 8, 9, 12, 15, 18, 19, 21, 23.

It should be noted that there were no recommendations viewed by a significant majority of participants as totally undesirable to implement. All participants recognized - some with praise and some with criticism - the general nature of the 1978 Master Plan, and most accepted the fact that much will have to be done to implement it.

In sum, the eight regional conferences on implementation of the 1978 Master Plan generated considerable discussion throughout the higher education community in Pennsylvania. Analyzing these conferences in light of the background information presented in the first section, the concluding section of this report (Part III) offers some observations on the regional conferences and on higher education coordination and statewide planning in Pennsylvania.

PART III

OBSERVATIONS

Did the regional conferences accomplish their stated purposes? How important were they to the master planning effort in Pennsylvania? Will they make a difference to implementation of the 1978 Master Plan? Does master planning affect higher education in Pennsylvania? Does master planning in Pennsylvania influence higher education in other states? Have we learned from them about the process or product of master planning?

These are the obvious questions but the answers are far from obvious. It is too early for a full perspective on the process, and too early to see many of the results. It also bears repeating that the author has only a partial view of master planning in Pennsylvania. Within the context of all these limitations, it is possible, however, to make some observations on the regional conferences and on master planning in Pennsylvania and its significance to higher education that may help answer these and related questions.

The Regional Conferences

First, the conferences did not completely fulfill the stated purpose of bringing together institutional, regional, departmental, and legislative representatives to discuss, plan, and recommend with respect to implementation of the 1978 Master Plan for Higher Education in Pennsylvania. While the 1978 Master Plan was discussed in all conferences, the organization and management of the conferences provided only for the expression of general reactions and broad areas of consensus or disagreement. No specific plans or commitments for implementation resulted, nor were specific means of pursuing the objectives of the 1978 Master Plan announced at the conferences.

Second, the conferences did fulfill several very important purposes, including the following:

a) They allowed for broad participation. Over 500 people spent a day discussing the 1978 Master Plan and its implementation. While the process of developing the 1978 Master Plan had involved many persons, the regional conferences provided an opportunity for many others to become thoroughly familiar with it. In a state the size of Pennsylvania, the achievement of broad participation is a significant accomplishment.

b) They allowed for dissemination of information. The conferences were used to great advantage by the 1202 Commission and the Department of Education to communicate to regions and institutions expectations with respect to implementation of the 1978 Master Plan. Institutions and regional councils also used the conferences to communicate their concerns to the Department and the State Board of Education, although greater preplanning could have resulted in a clearer and more forceful message.

c) They produced some general agreements on priorities for implementation of the 1978 Master Plan. It is not easy to achieve consensus on important policy matters and the opportunities afforded by the conferences for discussion and interaction were probably essential to these results. The leadership provided during the conferences by those college and university representatives who had been involved in the development of the 1978 Master Plan minimized the typically adversarial interactions between central agency staff and college and university representatives.

Third, the conferences provided an important opportunity for dialogue between a new Secretary of Education and the higher education community. Real differences were aired. The day before the first of the regional conferences, the media reported that the Secretary did not like the 1978 Master Plan and

wanted to start again. The reaction on the part of higher education was swift and defensive. Likewise, at the Region 4 Planning Council conference in State College, the Secretary carefully outlined his reactions to the 1978 Master Plan, including its strengths and weaknesses. College and university representatives again coalesced in defense of the 1978 Master Plan. This was particularly surprising since college and university spokespersons in the two prior conferences had offered many of the same criticisms as those made by Secretary Scanlon. Despite, or perhaps because of, these differences there may be positive results from the dialogue. It is unlikely that Secretary Scanlon will undertake master planning without participation by colleges and universities in the Commonwealth. For their part, college and university officials may be more open to centralized planning activities.

Fourth, the conferences promoted regionalization and thus served, in part, to implement the 1978 Master Plan. In many cases participants did succeed in rising above their own institutional perspectives and voiced the needs of the region as a whole. Participants seemed willing to work with the regional councils and the conferences were used to discuss future council activities. While specific planning for implementation of the 1978 Master Plan did not occur, the conferences were nonetheless a significant step forward for regionalization.

Fifth, the conferences may lead to greater cooperative activity among colleges and universities. In each of the conferences there were a number of suggestions made by Department of Education personnel and other participants which sparked interest. The participation of representatives from proprietary institutions fostered greater awareness of the broader scope of issues and concerns for postsecondary education. There seemed to be general agreement that this sector had received too little attention in the 1978 Master Plan.

Sixth, the unique coordinating and advocacy role of the Pennsylvania Association of Colleges and Universities seemed to be strengthened as a result of the conferences. Almost all speakers, including Secretary Scanlon, Mr. Sinkler, regional council chairmen and institutional representatives, commented on the importance of PACU and supported its activities.

Seventh, the conferences did not appear to serve as a very useful forum for interaction with the media or for dissemination of information about the 1978 Master Plan to the general public. Although media representatives attended most conferences, with one exception, they were not active participants. The Region 4 Planning Council organized a panel of television, radio, and newspaper representatives to comment on the 1978 Master Plan. They were unanimously critical of its lack of specifics, and generally critical of higher education for failing to work effectively with the media. At the same time, these media representatives appeared generally uninformed about the 1978 Master Plan and its recommendations.

Eighth, with the possible exceptions of the Southwestern Pennsylvania and the Delaware Valley conferences, the conferences did not seem to have a significant, immediate impact on legislators. Fewer than two dozen senators and representatives attended the conferences and the discussion between legislators and educators was minimal. At the same time, it is too early to judge the overall effect of the conferences and the 1978 Master Plan on the General Assembly. Dr. James Ream, Executive Director of PACU, reviewed the many recommendations in the 1978 Master Plan requiring action on the part of the General Assembly and provided his views on likelihood of passage. Some of the recommendations have already been embodied in bills currently before the General Assembly, but many others still require more work and justification before they can be presented. Dr. Ream suggested in the conferences that an interim implementation committee be established to continue working in this area until the

State Board of Education has made decisions on implementation of the 1978 Master Plan. In light of the Eulau and Quinley (1971) findings that few 1967 Pennsylvania Master Plan recommendations requiring action by the General Assembly were implemented, this would appear to be a good suggestion.

Master Planning and Coordination in Pennsylvania

First, the Pennsylvania system of coordinating higher education is distinctive in many ways. Specifically, it preserves a large measure of autonomy for institutions of higher education and it gives the State Board of Education and State Department of Education responsibility for elementary and secondary as well as higher education. One reflection of the way in which this institutional autonomy has influenced master planning in Pennsylvania is that the 1978 Master Plan was not drafted centrally by the Pennsylvania Department of Education or the 1202 Commission. It resulted from collaborative efforts with college and university officials. The 1978 Master Plan is a general statement of policy principles which includes a long list of more or less conventionally desirable items.

On the positive side, this has meant that in Pennsylvania there is not the acrimonious, adversarial interaction between the central agency and institutions that characterizes so many states. This remains true even as the 1978 Master Plan calls for more centralized coordinating and planning activity and delineates, more forcefully than in earlier plans, a statewide system of higher education. The 1978 Master Plan has been widely supported by colleges and universities and regional councils throughout the state.

On the negative side, the fact that the State Board of Education does not exercise strong regulatory or coordinating powers and the fact that the 1978 Master Plan is a general policy statement-which, as one conference participant noted, "does not require anybody to do anything at any time" - may mean that a

concerted effort will not be mounted to deal with the serious economic and enrollment problems facing Pennsylvania higher education in the future.

It is still too early to judge the final outcome, but the Pennsylvania structure for coordination and planning and the 1978 Master Plan taken together suggest that in the end it will be the institutions of higher education, and to some extent, the General Assembly that will determine how successfully Pennsylvania faces the future.

Second, in Pennsylvania the State Board of Education has responsibility for regulating one part of the system - the state colleges and universities - and for coordinating all of the system. Pennsylvania is the only state with this pattern of governance and coordination. Literature suggests that this dual role could lead to confusion of priorities and, possibly, to conflict of interest.

The 1978 Master Plan recommends a change in structure and governance that potentially eliminates this duality. If implemented, not only will the state college presidents have authority and responsibility comparable to that of other institutional heads in Pennsylvania, but the Pennsylvania Department of Education and the State Board of Education will be freed to concentrate on issues of overall coordination.

Third, the Pennsylvania system differs from other states in its use of regional councils. Given the decentralized nature of the system, the size of the state, and the number and diversity of institutions within the state, regionalization may prove more effective than centralization for coordination and planning in Pennsylvania. However, some statewide planning and coordination will still be necessary, and respective roles and responsibilities will have to be clearly delineated. In addition, regional councils may have to give up their "voluntary" status although conference participants saw this as an important aspect of regionalization.

Fourth, it is difficult and too early to evaluate the 1978 Master Plan. One can, however, assess the 1978 Master Plan in the areas suggested by those who have studied statewide coordination and planning. The assessment may provide insight for future planning efforts.

Berdahl (1971) readily admits that it is impossible to determine what "wise policy" is, but suggests that it is possible to determine if the process for making policy is fair to the various participants. The Pennsylvania process for developing the 1978 Master Plan appears to have been eminently fair to all participants. Task forces, public hearings, drafts and redrafts, provisions for written responses, implementation conferences and other activities ensured broad participation in the process. The result was widespread acceptance of statewide master planning as an important activity as well as support for the 1978 Master Plan itself.

The Carnegie Commission checklist for master plans is included in Part I. The 1978 Pennsylvania Master Plan conforms in general, but not in specifics to the Carnegie Commission suggestions. The 1978 Master Plan contains forceful goal statements and economic, demographic, and manpower projections, but does not tie the recommendations to these goals and projections. The mission statements for the five sectors of higher education are not tied to goals and they do not ensure diversity and differentiation of function among the sectors.

The 1978 Master Plan does not provide enrollment targets by sector or institution. It treats resource requirements in a general rather than specific fashion with the recommendations for increased state support, indexing, and the proposed task force to study formula funding. It does not analyze the quality of existing programs, but calls upon institutions to improve quality. While it makes a number of suggestions for academic programs, student services, affirmative action, and other areas, it does not prioritize or speak to resource

requirements for implementation. The same is true with respect to efficiency. It does not analyze, but merely recommends that institutions improve management efficiency.

The 1978 Master Plan includes most of Halstead's (1974) component features of master plans, although it treats the socioeconomic conditions of Pennsylvania and their implications for higher education with a very broad brush.

A comparison of the Pennsylvania 1978 Master Plan with Callan's (1975) ten characteristics for the evaluation of the planning efforts of statewide boards suggests that:

1) Pennsylvania's 1978 Master Plan can be judged effective in scope, participation, and implementation.
2) The 1978 Master Plan does not indicate how implementation will be monitored or what data will be used.
3) The 1978 Master Plan includes provisions for amendment and reevaluation, but not for integration with institutional planning efforts.
4) Assumptions are clearly stated in the 1978 Master Plan and, to some extent, a future agenda has emerged from the eight regional conferences.
5) The 1978 Master Plan does not give sufficient attention to the important question of incentives for implementation.

It would be unwise to indict the 1978 Master Plan for failures in these areas. The 1978 Master Plan calls for a comprehensive, decentralized system of higher education characterized by a coordinated planning effort that is dependent upon relatively autonomous institutions rather than state authorities for implementation. Such a system almost requires a master plan which makes broad suggestions for policy and allows colleges and universities to fill in the details. A full evaluation will be possible several years hence, but only

after a systematic assessment of what has been done to implement the recommendations contained in the 1978 Master Plan has been completed.

Finally, the experience in Pennsylvania can provide important information for the assessment of statewide coordination and master planning in the environment for higher education during the 1980's, and thus provide important insights for other states. Many colleges and universities in Pennsylvania currently are experiencing severe financial and enrollment problems. Projections for the future suggest even more serious difficulties for all sectors of higher education in the 1980's. During the period of stability (at best--substantial decline, at worst) in Pennsylvania higher education enrollments projected for the next decade, the effectiveness of this decentralized system of higher education will be severely tested.

EPILOGUE
(March 15, 1980)

Nine months have passed since this report was written and circulated in preliminary form. The purpose of this epilogue is to update the observations on the regional conferences and on master planning in Pennsylvania.

It has been observed that the regional conferences did not contribute significantly to the implementation of the 1978 Master Plan. The conferences could have been used to establish priorities for implementation among the many recommendations in the Master Plan, but they were not utilized in that way. Events subsequent to the regional conferences also reveal a failure to develop consensus on priorities. A voluminous report on the proceedings of the conferences was compiled and disseminated by the Pennsylvania Department of Education, but this document was not organized in a way that enlightened the reader on regional or institutional priorities. A meeting of regional council chairpersons was held in Harrisburg to discuss the regional conferences, and a report was made to the State Board of Education by a member of the Department of Education staff, but neither of these activities resulted in any public reports on the regional conferences. Given the widespread sense, as articulated by Secretary Scanlon and many others during the conferences, that the Plan's recommendations represent an ambitious "wish list" for higher education, the failure to establish priorities for implementation seems to constitute tacit agreement to ignore the Master Plan. The failure on the part of the State Board of Education and the Pennsylvania Department of Education to take the initiative in this regard suggests a lack of interest in, and commitment to, the 1978 Master Plan.

This general attitude with respect to the Master Plan as a whole seems to be reflected as well in connection with some of the specific recommendations. The first recommendation of the Plan reaffirms the commitment of the State Board of Education to a continuing planning process in which all postsecondary elements participate. Either the State Board is not committed to this recommendation as developments with respect to the 1978 Master Plan seem to suggest, or the Board and the Secretary are intentionally "shelving" this plan in order to initiate a more concrete and specific planning process. There is as yet no evidence of the latter, but Secretary Scanlon has emphasized repeatedly the importance of statewide planning for education.

The second recommendation of the 1978 Master Plan called upon the General Assembly to adopt legislation to transfer administrative responsibility for the state college and university system to an independent Board of Governors and Chancellor. Legislation to effect this change is currently before the General Assembly and has received the support of the Department of Education. The bill has been endorsed as well by most of the colleges and universities in Pennsylvania and by the Pennsylvania Association of Colleges and Universities (PACU). In this instance, there appears to be substantial congruity of purpose. Such a governance change, if enacted, will mean that Pennsylvania's unique pattern of vesting the State Board of Education with both coordinating and governing responsibilities will be eliminated.

Assuming that the change in governance for the state college and university system occurs, Pennsylvania would remain one of the few states in which the Secretary of Education, the State Board of Education, and the Department of Education are responsible for postsecondary as well as elementary and secondary education. However, this might also change. Legislation has been introduced in the General Assembly that would abolish the State Board of

Education in favor of a strong Secretary with direct legislative oversight. It is not yet clear what will happen to this bill, but if it passes and is signed by the Governor, Pennsylvania will again become unique with respect to patterns of coordination and governance for higher education.

In Recommendation 3 of the 1978 Master Plan, the State Board of Education unequivocally supported the concept of regional coordination and planning through regional higher education councils. The recommendation called for expanded financial support for the councils to enable them to facilitate interinstitutional programs and studies, information exchange, and several other cooperative endeavors. Despite this recommendation, the Department of Education has made it clear that it will not provide financial support for the regional councils beyond this fiscal year. Instead, the Department is supporting a bill, yet to be introduced, which would provide line item support for the councils in return for the fulfillment of certain reporting and other obligations. Several of the councils have not supported the draft legislation. At present, two of the regional council offices have closed and others plan to follow suit at the end of the 1979-80 academic year. Some of the larger councils may continue to operate with dues assessments from member institutions, but the councils will no longer serve the entire state. Thus the concept of regionalization for planning and coordinating purposes in Pennsylvania seems to be dead.

It is not impossible that both the State Board of Education (and with it the 1202 Commission) and most regional councils will be abolished. If this happens, there will be no mechanism apart from the Secretary and Department of Education for coordinating higher education in Pennsylvania. The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (1976:85) reported that no state is without a coordinating, planning, or consolidating mechanism covering the entire public sector. Pennsylvania may be the first to reverse this trend.

Given the complex nature of the state and the projected enrollment and fiscal difficulties, the results could be disastrous unless dramatic changes are made in the operation of the Department of Education.

It is still too soon to assess the performance of the General Assembly, State Board of Education and Department of Education with respect to the numerous Master Plan recommendations that relate to financial resources and which call for increases in levels of state support for each of the sectors of higher education in the Commonwealth. While little activity in this area has been reported in the public press, and budget projections for fiscal 1981 seem to suggest further declines in overall resources, it is too early to expect major accomplishments in this area.

It is also impossible to assess the extent to which colleges and universities responded to any of the recommendations of the 1978 Master Plan requiring initiative on their part. Many of the recommendations were generalized exhortations to the colleges and universities of Pennsylvania to improve quality, provide programs for disadvantaged students, encourage entry of women and minorities, establish effective management controls, and increase efficiency. It is worth noting, however, that the Plan itself does not provide for any mechanism for or criteria with which to assess implementation of these recommendations, and no subsequent activity at the state level suggests that such a mechanism is being contemplated. It may be that institutions are following the Secretary and State Board of Education and intend to "shelve" the 1978 Master Plan at least with respect to any specific activity on their part.

One is forced to conclude, therefore, that the overall prospects for master planning in Pennsylvania do not look good. Given the gloomy picture for higher education in Pennsylvania during the 1980's that is projected in the 1978 Master Plan both with respect to enrollments and economic conditions, this is cause for grave concern.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abrahams, Louise. State planning for higher education. Washington, D.C.: Academy for Educational Development, 1969.

Berdahl, Robert O. (Ed.) New Directions for Institutional Research: Evaluating Statewide Boards, 1975, 5 (Spring). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Berdahl, Robert O. Statewide coordination of higher education. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1971.

Berve, N. M. Survey of the structure of state coordinating boards and public institutional and multi-campus governing boards of postsecondary education--as of January 1, 1975. Higher Education in the States, 1975, 4 (10). Denver: Education Commission of the States.

Callan, Patrick M. Evaluating planning by statewide boards. New Directions for for Institutional Research: Evaluating Statewide Boards, 1975, 5 (Spring).

Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. The capitol and the campus: State responsibility for postsecondary education. New York: McGraw Hill, 1971.

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. The states and higher education. San Francisco: Jossey Bass, 1976.

Chambers, M. M. Higher education and state governments, 1970-1975. Danville, Illinois: Interstate Printers and Publishers, 1974.

Eulau, Heinz and Quinley, Harold. State officials and higher education: A survey of opinions and expectations of policy makers in nine states. New York: McGraw Hill, 1971.

Feinstein, Otto. Higher education in the United States. Lexington, Mass: Heath Lexington Books, 1971.

Glenny, L. A. and Weathersby, G. B. Statewide planning for postsecondary education: Issues and design. Boulder: National Center for Higher Education Management Systems, 1971.

Glenny, L. A. Autonomy of public colleges. New York: McGraw Hill, 1959.

Goodall, Leonard E. Emerging political issues for state coordinating boards. Journal of Higher Education, 1974, 45 (3), 219-228.

Goodall, Leonard E. State politics and higher education. Dearborn, Mich.: LMG Associates, 1976.

Halstead, D. Kent. Statewide planning in higher education. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Office of Education, 1974.

Harcleroad, F. F. (Ed.) Planning for state systems of postsecondary education. Iowa City: American College Testing Service, 1973.

Millard, Richard. State boards of higher education. Washington, D.C.: ERIC/AAHE Research Report No. 4, 1976.

Millett, J.D. Politics and higher education. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1974.

Millett, J.D. The management of state systems of higher education. James A. Perkins (Ed.) Higher education: From autonomy to systems. New York: International Council for Educational Development, 1972.

Nelson, Glenn M. Determination of appropriate form and functions of a Central Board for Higher Education in Pennsylvania as viewed by various groups of experts. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, 1971.

Palola, E. G., Lehmann, T., and Blischke, W. R. Higher education by design: The sociology of planning. Berkeley: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, 1970.

Pennsylvania Department of Education. Final report of the committee on education. Harrisburg: Pennsylvania Department of Education, 1961a.

Pennsylvania Department of Education. Report of the Governor's Committee of 100 for better education. Harrisburg: Pennsylvania Department of Education, 1961b.

Pennsylvania Department of Education. Regional coordinating councils reports of conferences on the master plan for higher education in Pennsylvania, 1978. Harrisburg: Pennsylvania Department of Education, 1979.

Pennsylvania Postsecondary Education Planning Commission. Task force reports and recommendations for the master plan for postsecondary education, 1978. Harrisburg: Pennsylvania Postsecondary Education Planning Commission, 1978.

Seavers, Gilmore B. The role of the State Council of Education in higher education in Pennsylvania. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University, 1965.

State Board of Education. The master plan for higher education in Pennsylvania. Harrisburg: State Board of Education, 1967.

State Board of Education. The master plan for higher education in Pennsylvania. Harrisburg: State Board of Education, 1971.

State Board of Education. The master plan for higher education in Pennsylvania. Harrisburg: State Board of Education, 1978.

Williams, Robert L. Legal bases for coordinating boards in thirty-eight states. Chicago: Council of State Governments, 1967.

APPENDIX

RECOMMENDATIONS CONTAINED IN

THE MASTER PLAN FOR HIGHER EDUCATION - 1978

Recommendation 1

The State Board of Education reaffirms its commitment to a continuing planning process in which all postsecondary education elements participate, and further commits itself to:

A. A planning process by which
   - the State Board of Education in its Master Plan identifies long-range policy objectives, institutional types, sector missions, and planning priorities for postsecondary institutions;
   - institutions are requested to respond to the Master Plan and any changes or additions thereto during the year following their adoption indicating how the Master Plan and the planning objectives and priorities of the State Board of Education will affect institutional planning, and to share these with the regional coordinating councils;
   - regional coordinating councils are requested to review the Master Plan and forward to the State Board of Education comments with respect to regional objectives;

B. A review of institutional and regional responses and the conduct of special studies by the Postsecondary Education Planning Commission and the Board. These special studies shall address, among others, graduate education, teacher education, health professions and veterinary education and the full spectrum of postsecondary education.

Recommendation 2

The State Board of Education recommends that the General Assembly adopt legislation for the governance of the state college and university system which shall transfer all administrative responsibility for the system to an independent Board of Governors and a Chancellor who shall be appointed by the Board of Governors to serve at its pleasure.

Recommendation 3

The State Board of Education supports regional coordination as an essential vehicle for voluntary cooperation and information exchange. This policy should be implemented by:

A. Expanding financial support to each regional coordinating council so that it may facilitate the development of interinstitutional programs and studies;

B. Facilitating regional information, counseling, and referral services;

C. Sharing of information through the councils to improve institutional management;

D. Utilizing the councils as the basis for consortia and other interinstitutional arrangements to eliminate unnecessary duplication, develop resource-sharing potential, and extend educational opportunities to unserved clients;

E. Encouraging councils to seek diversified sources of funding in addition to that supplied by the Commonwealth.

Recommendation 4

The State Board of Education commits itself to the continuance of an Advisory Committee to the Council of Higher Education, with membership to be determined by the Council of Higher Education.

Recommendation 5

The State Board of Education recommends to the General Assembly that state support for all public institutions should be adjusted upward annually to insure that tuition increases, if necessary, do not exceed the general rate of inflation.

Recommendation 6

The State Board of Education recommends that the Pennsylvania Higher Education Assistance Agency continue leadership in cooperation with the higher education community to develop and implement the following improvements in the administration of student financial aid:

A. Coordination of the Pennsylvania Higher Education Grants program with federal and other student aid programs;
B. Adoption of the standardized assessment procedure for measuring family ability to pay college costs according to individual family circumstances;
C. Continuation of a single statewide financial aid application form covering all student aid programs;
D. Adoption of a standardized calendar of events to maximize the opportunity for students to plan for further education and to complete such plans no later than March of their senior year of high school.

Recommendation 7

The State Board of Education recommends that the General Assembly provide financial support for part-time students who qualify on the basis of need, to be implemented by:

A. Defining financial aid eligibility to include matriculated students enrolled on at least a half-time basis in courses for academic credit;
B. Increasing funding of the Pennsylvania Higher Education Assistance Agency Grants program specifically for this purpose.

Recommendation 8

The State Board of Education recommends that the regional coordinating councils develop means to serve segments of the population whose geographic locations make it difficult for them to be served through existing programs.

Recommendation 9

The State Board of Education recommends that the Postsecondary Education Planning Commission appoint a task force to determine ways in which the disadvantaged, both rural and urban, can be reached.

Recommendation 10

The State Board of Education recommends that the Postsecondary Education Planning Commission conduct a study to determine areas where community colleges may feasibly be developed or where contracted services might be cost-effective, and subsequently recommends:

A. The further development, where financially feasible, of the community college system in coordination with its approved plan;
B. Development of both authority and funding for contractual and/or other arrangements between the Department and institutions or other

arrangements between the Department and the regional coordinating councils to meet special needs at the two-year and associate degree levels;

C. Financial support for pilot contractual arrangements, as in B above, prior to commitments to regular contractual support for needed programs.

Recommendation 11

The State Board of Education encourages all higher education institutions to become sensitive to the educational and skill deficiencies of all current and potential students, with particular attention to the disadvantaged and handicapped. The State Board recommends strategies to remedy these deficiencies, including:

A. Support for transition courses and programs that help disadvantaged and handicapped students develop their potential;

B. Concerted efforts to amend Section 504 of the Federal Rehabilitation Act to provide programs, services and funds for the handicapped in an equitable manner;

C. The development of a state plan, including financial aid, to permit relocation of handicapped persons so that higher educational programs and services are available at individual institutions or through consortia to every qualified Pennsylvania citizen, regardless of a particular handicap.

Recommendation 12

The State Board of Education reaffirms its commitment to equal educational opportunity and recommends that:

A. Institutions encourage the increased entry of women and minorities into higher education, particularly professional and graduate programs;

B. Institutions assess causes of student attrition and seek to improve retention rates;

C. The Commonwealth continue to support and strengthen the role of traditionally black institutions in the state system.

Recommendation 13

The State Board of Education, reaffirming its commitment to academic excellence, recommends that institutions:

A. Clearly define their criteria for the achievement of institutional quality;

B. Continue to search for ways to improve the quality of their academic programs;

C. Assure that students demonstrate competence appropriate for the various academic degrees;

D. Develop qualitative standards permitting students to be awarded academic credit on the basis of acquired knowledge.

Recommendation 14

The State Board of Education recommends that each institution of higher education improve the quality of its undergraduate academic programs and encourages each institution to:

A. Strengthen its general education program,

B. Correct skill deficiencies to assure that each student can perform at an acceptable collegiate level.

Recommendation 15

The State Board of Education, recognizing that higher educational programs need to relate to the cultural and economic needs of the individual and society, shall develop guidelines for the periodic review of all programs for which the Board has review authority.

Recommendation 16

The State Board of Education reaffirms its policy on global education and encourages each institution to:

A. Educate students in the history, government, economy, and cultures of the United States, and the interdependence of the United States with other nations in the world community;
B. Educate students in the language, history, and culture of other countries, and in perception of international relationships;
C. Provide exchange of faculty and students with institutions of other countries.

Recommendation 17

The State Board of Education encourages appropriate institutional use of new modes of instruction and educational technology to:

A. Meet the increasingly complex needs of students;
B. Reach new clientele;
C. Increase the efficiency of the educational process;
D. Serve such other purposes as may be suggested by a Department of Education study of such new modes and related policy options.

Recommendation 18

The State Board of Education recommends that the General Assembly provide the financial support essential to improve and maintain the strength and quality of the Commonwealth's system of graduate and professional education, and the financial support essential to maintain tuition policies that will ensure equality of access to publicly-supported programs.

Recommendation 19

The State Board of Education, recognizing that a dominant characteristic of education is its continuing nature and function, is committed to the concept of continuing education for all Pennsylvanians, and recommends that:

A. Fiscal policies of the Commonwealth ensure and support continuing education opportunities for out-of-school youths and adults who need and can benefit from further education;
B. The resources of existing institutions and instructional programs be utilized for continuing education to avoid additional cost and unnecessary duplication, acknowledging, however, that for reasons of accessibility, cost, and diversity, different or new resources may be required to meet learning needs.

Recommendation 20

The State Board of Education, believing that all Pennsylvanians should have equal access to counseling about curricula and programs, recommends that:

A. Local school districts improve counseling and guidance services for all students;
B. The General Assembly support a statewide system of educational counseling and information services;
C. Higher educational institutions provide counseling for all students, presenting opportunities for postgraduate study and assistance in career planning and placement;

D. Higher educational institutions conduct a comprehensive follow-up of graduates to provide feedback for both the faculty and current students.

Recommendation 21

The State Board of Education, recognizing the importance of academic research to the economic and social development of the Commonwealth, recommends that agencies of state government examine ways in which the research capabilities of its colleges and universities can be employed to promote the development of the Commonwealth and the welfare of its citizens.

Recommendation 22

The State Board of Education advocates equitable standards for transfer of students in postsecondary education, and recommends that:

A. Institutions disseminate adequate information about their academic requirements;
B. Regional coordinating councils improve planning and coordination of programs within regions;
C. Articulation agreements between community colleges or secondary vocational schools and four-year institutions be continually reviewed to identify particularly desirable practices;
D. Institutions develop articulation agreements and liberally interpret their general education requirements to facilitate interinstitutional student transfers;
E. Senior institutions, in seeking the approval of accrediting organizations, preserve program articulation with junior institutions, thereby assuring students access to baccalaureate degree programs without penalty.

Recommendation 23

The State Board of Education recommends that the two councils of the Board provide leadership for cooperation among interested parties for improved integration of secondary and postsecondary curricula.

Recommendation 24

The State Board of Education recommends that the constitution of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania be amended to require that all appropriations for institutions of higher education be acted upon by the General Assembly--concurrently with the General Appropriations Bill--by a constitutional majority vote prior to the beginning of the fiscal year.

Recommendation 25

The State Board of Education favors quantitative measures or standards for the appropriation of state funds to institutions and recommends a broadly-based task force to develop formulas for the state colleges and university and state-related institutions and to design a statewide system for collecting student information upon which such formulas can be calculated.

Recommendation 26

The State Board of Education recommends that, in the Community College System:

A. State support should be increased to provide no less than one-third of total operational costs, plus the stipend for approved occupational and technical programs;
B. State funds should continue to provide no less than 50 percent of capital costs;
C. Remaining costs should be shared by the sponsor, the student and federal and other sources;
D. Funding levels should be indexed for inflationary cost increases.

Recommendation 27

The State Board of Education, recognizing the benefits of higher education which accrue both to the public and individuals, recommends to the General Assembly that state support to the state colleges and university and the state-related institutions be adjusted annually to insure that tuition increases at these public institutions do not exceed the general rate of inflation.

Recommendation 28

The State Board of Education recommends that in certain health-related fields such as medicine, dentistry, veterinary medicine, optometry, podiatry and public health:

A. The state should act promptly to increase current levels of funding to state-related medical schools to at least 50 percent of total educational costs;
B. State support to institutions in the public sector should exceed 50 percent of total educational costs, as necessary, to insure equality of access and the maintenance of academic quality in medicine and dentistry;
C. Consideration should be given to providing adequate and specific support to the Graduate School of Public Health at the University of Pittsburgh, the School of Veterinary Medicine at the University of Pennsylvania, the Pennsylvania College of Optometry and the Pennsylvania College of Podiatric Medicine.

Recommendation 29

The State Board of Education shall, either directly or through a special commission, clarify public issues relating to funding state-aided institutions. Specific policy recommendations, including the use of appropriate quantitative standards, shall be developed for funding each state-aided institution on a case by case basis, as part of an equitable and reliable state-financing pattern for all sectors of higher education in Pennsylvania.

Recommendation 30

The State Board of Education recommends that state support to independent institutions should be:

A. Channeled primarily through the Institutional Assistance Grants program;
B. Reviewed annually so that the magnitude of the Institutional Assistance Grants are adjusted in relation to inflation and the tuition differential between public and independent institutions;
C. Maintained adequately so that the Institutional Assistance Grants continue to be directly related to the number of students enrolled at each institution who receive financial assistance grants from the Pennsylvania Higher Education Assistance Agency.

Recommendation 31

The State Board of Education recommends that state support to specialized associate degree-granting institutions continue to be provided indirectly through the Pennsylvania Higher Education Assistance Agency loans and grants to students, except in the case of nonprofit institutions, which should continue to be eligible for Institutional Assistance Grants.

Recommendation 32

The State Board of Education recommends that the General Assembly continue to provide reasonable financial support for research in science, arts and

humanities at qualified institutions of higher education. This support should be implemented by:

A. Continuing to fund research related to special missions of the Commonwealth universities by direct institutional appropriations;
B. Allocating research funds through competitive awards by departments of state government and/or the Pennsylvania Science and Engineering Foundation.

Recommendation 33

The State Board of Education recommends that state capital funding:

A. Emphasize repair and renovation of existing facilities, except for unusual cases where new facilities can be justified;
B. Provide for repair and renovation as a line item in each institution's appropriation;
C. Be made available for emergency grants and long-term, low-interest state loans or state guaranteed loans for essential repair and renovations at independent institutions.

Recommendation 34

The State Board of Education recommends that the Pennsylvania Higher Education Assistance Agency Board of Directors develop and approve a plan whereby increased appropriation requests for the state's higher education grant program will take into account the fact that:

A. Family income limitation should be adjusted annually in relation to inflation;
B. Maximum state higher education grants to students should be raised each year in proportion to increases in inflation, rising tuition levels, and related educational costs.

Recommendation 35

The State Board of Education, recognizing the need for achieving more effective use of limited resources, recommends that institutions improve their management controls and increase the efficiency of their operations.

Recommendation 36

The State Board of Education, recognizing the potential impact of projected declining enrollments on academic programs, recommends:

A. A moratorium on the establishment of any additional higher educational institutions, campuses or centers except where it can be shown that educational needs can be met in no other way;
B. The establishment, by the Department of Education in cooperation with the higher education community, of a resource data bank and cooperative consulting service;
C. Development of a process by which the Commonwealth can provide services by contracting with existing institutions, amending institutional missions, or reclassifying institutions within the state college and university and state-related sectors.

Recommendation 37

The State Board of Education recommends that governmental agencies carefully examine the costs to higher educational institutions for compliance associated with statutes and regulations, with a view to reducing those burdens insofar as possible, and to eliminate redundance in reporting and record keeping requirements.